

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 9-14, 54 and 56, which are amended, are pending in the present application. Claims 1-8, 15-53, 55, 57 and 58 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification and specifically at pages 62, 68 and 72. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 9-15, 26-28, 35-39, 50-52, and 54, and 56-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that the present Amendment obviates this rejection.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9-15, 26-28, 35-39, 50-52, 54, and 56-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,469 to Dozier et al. (hereinafter,

merely “Dozier”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,995,099 to Horstmann (hereinafter, merely “Horstmann”).

Generally, the present claimed invention relates to a system in which a common source of web content permits use of the web content by other web sites. However, in order to maintain control over the web content, the other web sites are not permitted to edit, or modify, portions of the original web content. Thus, the owner of the original web content can control what portions may be edited. The edited content and original content may be used on another website and links may be provided so that a user of another website can link back to the original web content.

Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*:

“...identifying web content associated with a first source;

identifying one or more first-type of web pages of the web content, which a user has authority to edit;

identifying one or more second-type of web pages of the web content which the user does not have authority to edit;

identifying web content associated with a second source;

placing a link on at least one of the first-type of web pages that links the first-type of web page to the web content associated with the second source..” (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Dozier, or Horstmann, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 9. Specifically, neither Dozier nor Horstmann describe identifying web pages that a user may edit and web pages that a user may not edit. Indeed, as claimed, the present invention permits limiting editing of web content provided by a content provider by establishing selected content that may be edited and other selected content that may not be edited.

Furthermore, the present invention claims that a link is provided, on web content that may be edited, that permits linking of the edited pages to content of a second source.

Applicants submit that at least these two features (1) distinguishing between content that may be edited and content that may not be edited and (2) linking edited content to a second source are distinguished from Dozier and Horstmann.

Independent claims 54 and 56 recite similar, or somewhat similar features.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800